

and the remaining 85 percent of the reimbursable costs would be paid from collections to the LCRBDF as costs for construction are incurred. To cover the reimbursable costs allocated to the UCRBF, CBO expects that the federal government would increase its power surcharge rate beginning in fiscal year 2002. We expect that no rate change would be made to cover costs allocated to the LCRBDF because this fund is currently running an annual surplus of about \$9 million.

6. Comparison with spending under current law: None.

7. Pay-as-you-go considerations: None.

8. Estimated cost to State and local governments: None.

9. Estimate comparison: None.

10. Previous CBO estimate: None.

11. Estimate prepared by: Ian McCormick and Susanne S. Mehlman.

12. Estimate approved by:

PAUL N. VAN DE WATER,  
Assistant Director  
for Budget Analysis.●

### GET OFF CUBA'S BACK

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, William Raspberry's column in the Washington Post and other newspapers around the Nation frequently gives us insights into our society and our policies that are important.

Recently, he had a column under the title "Get Off Cuba's Back" that pointed out how ridiculous our current policy toward Cuba is.

As I have said on the floor before, if Fidel Castro and the Soviet Union had a series of meetings to create an American policy that would make sure Castro would remain in power, they could not have devised a better policy than the one the United States has followed.

We should forget our illusions about overthrowing Castro, and move in the direction of trying to influence him to ameliorate his policies.

The William Raspberry column hits the nail on the head.

I ask that the column be printed in the RECORD.

The column follows:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 3, 1995]

GET OFF CUBA'S BACK

(By William Raspberry)

Why doesn't the United States get off Cuba's back?

The question is meant literally, not rhetorically. In what way is it in the interest of the United States to cut Cuba off from the rest of the world, to wreck its economy and starve its people?

When there was a Cold War, the reasons were understandable enough—even to those who disagreed with them. Cuba was on outpost of international communism and right in our back yard. Communist leaders, whether in the Soviet Union or in China, were eager to use Fidel Castro as an annoyance to the United States and as the means of spreading communism throughout the hemisphere. There were even times when the communist-expansion-by-proxy scheme seemed to be working, and it didn't make sense for us to sit idly by and let it happen.

The alternate? Isolate Cuba from its neighbors, crush pro-communist revolutions wherever they occurred in the region, encourage the Cuban people to overthrow their despotic leader and serve notice to the communist world that it would be permitted no exploitable foothold 90 miles from our shores. That,

as far as I can figure it, is how our opposition to Castro's Cuba became such an obsession.

But that was then. This is now, and I cannot find any logical reason for continuing our Cold War attitude toward Cuba—or Castro. Certainly there is no threat that anyone else in Latin America will be tempted to follow Cuba's disastrous economic path. Cuba, no longer anyone's well-financed puppet, is hardly a military or political threat to destabilize its neighbors. And if anything is clear, it's that the Cubans (in Cuba) have no intention of overthrowing the aging Castro.

But even if they did, so what? Absent the Cold War, why do we care that Castro continues to try to manage a communist state? Doesn't China, with whom we are panting to do more business? We're buddy-buddy with the Russians now—lending them money, supporting their leaders and again, doing business with them.

Isn't there business to be done with Cuba? To this recently reformed cigar smoker, the answer is obvious. And not just Habanas, either. There's sugar and rum and tourism on their side and (prospectively) cars and machinery and other sales and service opportunities on ours.

Isn't it likely that international trade and the concomitant exposure of Cuban citizens to the advantages of capitalism would do more to move Cuba away from communism than has a 30-year U.S.-led embargo of the island?

Or can it be that we don't care whether Cuba abandons communism or not? Officially, of course, we do care. It is, ostensibly, what our policy is about. Members of Congress—notably Sen. Jesse Helms (R-N.C.) and much of the Florida delegation—justify their call for yet tougher sanctions against Cuba on the ground that the new measures will finally topple the regime.

My fear is that the motivations are less philosophical—and significantly less noble—than that. Two things seem to be driving our anti-Castro policy: Cubans in Florida and sheer vengeance.

Few politicians with aspirations for national leadership seem willing to take on the Miami-based Cubans who (like the followers of Chiang Kai-shek) see themselves as a sort of government-in-exile and dream of a triumphant return to their homeland. There being no significant pro-Castro lobby here, the hopeful antis carry the political day.

Keeping these next-Christmas-in-Havana dreamers tractable is, I suspect, one reason for our policy. The other may be a sort of institutional rage that Castro has withstood an international missile confrontation, the Bay of Pigs, any number of unsuccessful CIA plots against him and the demise of international communism—and still sits there as a rebuke to our hegemony.

Our officials keep hinting that Castro is ailing, or aging or losing his iron-fisted control. No need to think of economic concessions or diplomatic rethinking now. . . just hold out a few months longer, and watch him fall like a ripe plum.

And, of course, use our political and economic power to shake the tree.

But to what purpose of ours? Isn't it time to stop making our official hatred of one increasingly harmless old man the basis of our foreign policy?

Why don't we get off Cuba's back?●

### LONDONDERRY HIGH SCHOOL BAND PERFORMS IN WASHINGTON, DC.

● Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to the Londonderry High School "Lancer" Marching Band and Colorguard from London-

derry, NH. The Lancers recently performed here in the Nation's Capital for the 1995 Washington, DC St. Patrick's Day parade and received awards for their performance.

The Lancer Marching Band and Colorguard, under the able direction of Mr. Andrew Soucy, have a proud tradition of representing the Granite State in parades across the country. In addition to the St. Patrick's Day parade, they have marched in the Pasadena Tournament of Roses Parade and, just this year, performed for the New England Patriots football team at Foxboro Stadium in Massachusetts.

These fine young men and women demonstrate the hard work and dedication that is characteristic of the Granite State students. They have proven that determination and teamwork are the hallmark of success both as musicians and students. The Lancer Band and Colorguard are outstanding ambassadors for New Hampshire.

Mr. President, I want to express my thanks to both the students and faculty at Londonderry High School for their commitment to excellence. It is an honor to represent them in the U.S. Senate.●

### INVEST NOW, OR PAY MORE LATER

● Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I respectfully submit into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement from Mayor Richard J. Riordan of Los Angeles on the issue of the Davis-Bacon Act and Prevailing Wage laws.

Mr. President, I ask that Mayor Riordan's full statement be printed in the RECORD.

The statement follows:

INVEST NOW, OR PAY MORE LATER

(By Mayor Richard J. Riordan)

"You can pay now or pay later" is more than grandmotherly advice. It is a healthy dose of financial wisdom which all levels of government ought to heed. In fact, the pay now approach is a goal-oriented investment strategy that considers current and future needs. The pay later scenario is highly reactive, unpredictable and void of strategy.

Unfortunately for Angelinos and our local businesses community, Los Angeles city government is too reliant on the pay later approach, which really translates to "pay more later." The cost to the city by failing to invest is hundreds of millions of dollars in deferred maintenance and the taking of precious investment dollars for short-term crises. For example, due to years of inadequate funding for street maintenance, 111 miles of Los Angeles City streets are beyond repair and must be totally reconstructed at an estimated cost of \$150 million. It costs five times as much to reconstruct a street as it does to maintain it.

Investment in affordable housing, streets, sidewalks, parks, library buildings, schools, water storage, railways, airports and port facilities is good business. Directly, this investment in infrastructure generates tens of thousands of construction jobs. Over the long-term, it creates a climate where businesses will stay and come out of their own self-interest because the quality of life is better—streets are safer, long term economic

investment is more secure and more jobs are available.

But it takes a lot more taxpayer dollars to build infrastructure.

It takes investment in human capital, too, and the same "invest now or pay more later" logic should apply. There are some existing strong partnerships between the public and private sectors and organized labor which have wisely adopted a goal-oriented strategy. Prevailing wage laws—created by the federal, state and local governments, in partnership with the building trades and business—have attracted skilled labor with the expertise and experience to complete projects on time and within budget. The Santa Monica Freeway is a shining example; it was reconstructed to the highest quality standards, ahead of schedule and under budget in the aftermath of the Northridge earthquake. Public infrastructure projects have also expanded career opportunities for young people. Some of the best technical training in our region is available through the organized building trades. The facilities are first rate, and the curriculum is fully up-to-date and forward looking.

Against the strong arguments for pay-now versus pay more later, those in the Washington beltway who would eliminate the Davis Bacon Act are shortsighted in their thinking. According to a recent study by the University of Utah Economics Department, in the nine states which have repealed prevailing wage laws, the pay more later rule has kicked in, with the net result being reduced wages for construction workers, increased workplace injuries and deaths, a decline in job training, a loss of tax revenue to the state and increased cost overruns.

Retaining the Davis-Bacon Act and our prevailing wage laws is critical to the public private partnership which has worked so well in developing our public infrastructure and the highly skilled workforce upon which it depends. In so doing, we can continue to build great projects, produce the good paying jobs and careers our economy must have, and save millions of taxpayer dollars in the process. And we can all rest a little easier knowing that the next time the earth moves, we will still have skilled contractors and construction workers needed to get the job done.●

#### KOWTOW: THE STATE DEPARTMENT'S BOW TO BEIJING

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, recently, Lorna Hahn had an op-ed piece in the Washington Post titled, "Kowtow: The State Department's Bow to Beijing."

What she says there makes eminent sense.

I cannot understand our continuing to give a cold shoulder to President Lee of Taiwan.

I trust our Government will make its decision known soon that it will do the responsible thing and let President Lee come to our country. He is a freely elected president of a multiparty country with a free press. We should not give him the cold shoulder because another nation without these human rights objects.

I ask that the Lorna Hahn item be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The item follows:

KOWTOW—THE STATE DEPARTMENT'S BOW TO BEIJING.

(By Lorna Hahn)

Lee Teng-hui, president of the Republic of China on Taiwan, wishes to accept an honor-

ary degree from Cornell University, where he earned his PhD in agronomy.

Last year, when Cornell made the same offer, Lee was refused entry into the United States because Beijing belligerently reminded the State Department that granting a visa to a Taiwanese leader would violate the principle of "One China." (Cornell subsequently sent an emissary to Taipei for a substitute ceremony.) This year, on Feb. 9, Assistant Secretary of State Winston Lord told a congressional hearing that our government "will not reverse the policies of six administrations of both parties."

It is high time it did. The old policy was adopted at a time when China and Taiwan were enemies, Taiwan's government claimed to represent all of China, and Beijing's leaders would never dream of meeting cordially with their counterparts from Taipei. Today, things are very different.

Upon assuming office in 1988, Lee dropped all pretense of ever reconquering the mainland and granted that the Communists do indeed control it. Since then, he has eased tensions and promoted cooperation with the People's Republic of China through the Lee Doctrine, the pragmatic, flexible approach through which he (1) acts independently without declaring independence, which would provoke Chinese wrath and perhaps an invasion; (2) openly recognizes the PRC government and its achievements and asks that it reciprocate, and (3) seeks to expand Taiwan's role in the world while assuring Beijing that he is doing so as a fellow Chinese who has their interests at heart as well.

Lee claims to share Beijing's dream of eventual reunification—provided it is within a democratic, free-market system. Meanwhile, he wants the PRC—and the world—to accept the obvious fact that China has since 1949 been a divided country, like Korea, and that Beijing has never governed or represented Taiwan's people. Both governments, he believes, should be represented abroad while forging ties that could lead to unity.

To this end he has fostered massive investments in the mainland, promoted extensive and frequent business, cultural, educational and other exchanges, and offered to meet personally with PRC President Jiang Zemin to discuss further cooperation. His policies are so well appreciated in Beijing—which fears the growing strength of Taiwan's pro-independence movement—that Jiang recently delivered a highly conciliatory speech to the Taiwanese people in which he suggested that their leaders exchange visits.

If China's leaders are willing to welcome Taiwan's president to Beijing, why did their foreign ministry, on March 9, once again warn that "we are opposed to Lee Teng-hui visiting the United States in any form"? Because Beijing considers the "Taiwan question" to be an "internal affair" in which, it claims, the United States would be meddling if it granted Lee a visa.

But Lee does not wish to come here in order to discuss the "Taiwan question" or other political matters, and he does not seek to meet with any American officials. He simply wishes to accept an honor from a private American institution, and perhaps discuss with fellow Cornell alumni the factors that have contributed to Taiwan's—and China's—outstanding economic success.

President Clinton has yet to make the final decision regarding Lee's visit. As Rep. Sam Gejdenson (D-Conn.) recently stated: "It seems to me illogical not to allow President Lee on a private basis to go back to his alma mater." As his colleague Rep. Gary Ackerman (D-N.Y.) added: "It is embarrassing for many of us to think that, after encouraging the people and government on Taiwan to democratize, which they have, [we forbid President Lee] to return to the United States \* \* \* to receive an honorary degree."●

#### ETNA SWIMMER WINS GOLD IN PAN AMERICAN GAMES

● Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to Barbara (B.J.) Bedford of Etna, NH for capturing three gold medals for swimming in the women's 100 meter and 200 meter backstroke, and as a member of the 4 x 100 meter medley relay, at the Pan American Games held in Mar del Plata, Argentina, March 11 to 26, 1995.

The U.S. Olympic committee sent 800 athletes, including 159 current Olympians, to compete in the 12th Pan Am Games—its largest contingent ever. B.J.'s performance was remarkable and one for which she can be very proud.

B.J. has not only excelled at the Pan Am Games, but she was the bronze medalist in the 100 meter in the 1994 World Championships and is the 11th fastest woman in history in the 100 meter backstroke. At the 1994 Goodwill Games, she won two gold medals in the 200 meter backstroke and 400 meter medley relay and a silver medal in the 100 meter backstroke. She is a three-time U.S. national champion. Currently, B.J. is training for the 1996 Olympics in Gainesville, FL.

B.J. is the daughter of Frederick and Jane Bedford of Etna. She attended Hanover High School and Kimball Union Academy in New Hampshire where she swam with the North Country Aquatics Club. She graduated from the University of Texas in 1994 with a degree in Art History.

On behalf of the citizens of the Granite State, congratulations to Barbara Bedford for a job well done. We are very proud to have this world-class competitor represent New Hampshire at the Pan American Games and look forward to following her future successes. It is an honor to represent Barbara and her family in the U.S. Senate.●

#### IN TRIBUTE TO NANCY D'ALESSANDRO

● Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to Mrs. Nancy D'Alesandro, a first-class First Lady of Baltimore. She was a dedicated wife, mother of 6, grandmother of 16 and the driving force behind a family that distinguished itself in Baltimore and in Washington.

Nancy D'Alesandro was a Baltimore institution. There was nobody closer to the street or closer to the people. From 1947 to 1959, her husband Thomas D'Alesandro served as mayor of Baltimore and Nancy was a hands-on first lady. Likewise, she provided endless support during her husband's years in the U.S. House of Representatives.

Devoted to her children, she was there for her son, Thomas D'Alesandro III, who also served a term as mayor of Baltimore and she was there for her daughter Nancy Pelosi, who currently